



NC Public Schools – READY for Success

Educator Effectiveness Update

**February 3, 2012
Jennifer Preston
Dr. Eliz Colbert**



Overview

1. Today's Policies in Context of Overall Initiative
2. Proposal for Revisions to TCP-C-006
3. Sample Summary Sheet for Educator Evaluation



Today's Policies in Context of Overall Initiative



What We Need

Required, standard, objective measurement of the effect each teacher has on each student's learning



Completed (Summer 2011)
Added Sixth and Eighth Standards

Measures of student growth in all content areas



In Progress (2011-12)
Measures of Student Learning Design Process
(Phase One of Three Completed)

A common statewide process for identifying “effective” teachers and leaders



Targeted for Completion (February 2012)
Second Set of State Board Policies on Educator Effectiveness



What We Need

- Rating categories for the sixth and eighth standards
- Statewide growth model
- Statewide definitions of statuses of educators



Proposal for Revisions to TCP-C-006 Sixth and Eighth Standards



Key Elements

1. Yearly rating for teachers and administrators
2. Three rating categories
 - Does not meet expected growth
 - Meets expected growth
 - Exceeds expected growth



Student Growth Value

Administrators: average for all students

Teachers: three options for combining

- Students (of the teacher)
- School-wide (as above)



Three Options

The student growth value could be:

Option One

10% School-Wide

90% Individual

Option Two

20% School-Wide

80% Individual

Option
Three

30% School-Wide

70% Individual



Educator Effectiveness Work Group

The Work Group members were divided between Option One (90% individual; 10% school-wide) and Option Three (70% individual; 30% school-wide)



Option One

Pros:

- Bases an individual's evaluation heavily on an individual's student growth value
- Recognizes one teacher's limited ability to influence an entire faculty

Cons:

- Incentivizes competition between teachers
- Fails to recognize collaboration in PLCs



Option Three

Pros:

- Incentivizes a school-wide sense of responsibility for the education of all students
- Recognizes the important role of PLCs, mentor teachers, and other support programs

Cons:

- Fails to recognize that one teacher may not be able to influence an entire faculty
- Makes an individual evaluation more dependent on a group outcome



Proposal for Revisions to TCP-C-006 Statewide Growth Model



The Overarching Question

Which student academic growth model should NC use to determine sixth and eighth standard ratings for teachers and principals?



Sub-Questions

1. Which student academic growth models demonstrate technical adequacy?
2. Of those models that demonstrate technical adequacy, which meet other important criteria?



Value-Added Models

Use links between teachers and their students

Predict a student's score on an assessment

Attribute the difference between a predicted and actual score to above or below average instruction



Question One:

Which student academic growth models demonstrate technical adequacy?



How to Answer Question One

New, NC-specific study: Comparing Value-added Models For Estimating Teacher Effectiveness

Study completed by Drs. Rose, Henry, and Lauen of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Part of Race to the Top Evaluation



Answer to Question One

The **HLM3**, **URM**, and **SFE** are all technically adequate models to be used for determining sixth and eighth standard ratings for teachers and principals



Question Two:
Of those models that
demonstrate technical
adequacy, which meet other
important criteria?



How to Answer Question Two

Series of reports and recommendation by WestEd, a research and policy development non-profit agency selected by NCDPI to advise on selection of growth model

Dr. Carole Gallagher serves as lead consultant with support from technical and policy experts at WestEd



Research Process

Phase One: Conduct literature review

Phase Two: Identify evaluation criteria, including those other than technical adequacy

Phase Three: Review UNC-CH report

Phase Four: Make recommendation for SBE adoption of statewide model



Phase One

Phase One: Conduct literature review

Review of research literature that targeted theoretically and empirically based support for various statistical models of student growth

Identify the relative strengths and limitations of the models used most widely for the purpose of estimating teacher effectiveness.



Phase Two

Phase Two: Identify evaluation criteria, including those other than technical adequacy

Criteria include:

- Technical adequacy (validity, reliability, and fairness) of the model for the intended purpose
- Face validity with teachers and other stakeholders
- Theory- or research-based support
- Ease of use statewide for incorporating a measure of student growth in the NCEES
- Resource requirements
- Policy implications



Phase Three

Phase Three: Review UNC-CH report

WestEd technical experts agree with the methodology used in the study and praise the researchers for their extensive work

After reviewing the results of the various tests conducted, the experts agree with the three recommended models



Phase Four

Phase Four: Make recommendation for SBE adoption of statewide model

When evaluated with the six criteria, the **EVAAS URM** and **MRM** are the most well-suited for statewide use



Answer to Question Two

The **EVAAS URM and MRM** are technically strong, already known to educators within NC, supported by research, function within existing budget constraints, can be easily added to the NCEES, and are consistent with existing policy



The Overarching Question

Which student academic growth model should NC use to determine sixth and eighth standard ratings for teachers and principals?



Overall Recommendation

The SBE should adopt the EVAAS URM and MRM to determine sixth and eighth standard ratings for teachers and principals



Proposal for Revisions to TCP-C-006 Effectiveness Statuses



Three Statuses for Educators

1. In Need of Improvement
2. Effective
3. Highly Effective



Sixth/Eighth Standard

To determine effectiveness, a three-year rolling average of student growth values will be calculated:

Year One	Year Two	Year Three	Rolling Average
1.2	.8	1.0	1.0

And a rating will be assigned:

MEETS EXPECTED GROWTH



In Need of Improvement

Rating:

Standards 1-5

Any rating lower
than proficient

And/or

Standard 6

Does not meet
expected growth

Status:

**In Need of
Improvement**



In Need of Improvement

Rating:

Standards 1-7

Any rating lower
than proficient

And/or

Standard 8

“Does not meet
expected growth”

Status:

**In Need of
Improvement**



Effective

Rating of “Meets
expected growth”
on Standard Six

Proficient or
Higher on
Standards 1 - 5

Effective Teacher



Effective

Rating of “Meets
expected growth”
on Standard Eight

Proficient or
Higher on
Standards 1 - 7

Effective
Administrator



Highly Effective

Rating of
“Exceeds
expected growth”
on Standard Six

Accomplished or
Higher on
Standards 1 - 5

Highly Effective
Teacher



Highly Effective

Rating of
“Exceeds
expected growth”
on Standard Eight

Accomplished or
Higher on
Standards 1 - 7

Highly Effective
Administrator



Sample Summary Sheet for Educator Evaluation



Display of All Information

- Ratings on Standards 1 – 5 of the Educator Evaluation System (as recorded in online tool).
- Yearly Standard 6 rating
- Three-year rolling average of student growth values and accompanying Standard 6 rating (for effectiveness determination)
- Overall teacher status



Summary Sheet

Draft January 2012: Assume SBE Adoption of Option One in TCP-C-006

North Carolina Educator Evaluation System Evaluation Summary Sheet

Name: Martha Washington **School:** Independence Elementary School
LEA: Freedom County Schools **Licensure:** Career-Status
Overall Status: Effective

Standard One: Teachers demonstrate leadership.

Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
------------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

Standard Two: Teachers establish a respectful environment.

Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
------------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

Standard Three: Teachers know the content they teach.

Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
------------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

Standard Four: Teachers facilitate learning for their students.

Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
------------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

Standard Five: Teachers reflect on their practice.

Not Demonstrated	Developing	Proficient	Accomplished	Distinguished
------------------	------------	------------	--------------	---------------

Standard Six: Teachers contribute to the academic success of students.

* Only three-year rolling average is used to determine overall status *

Year One (2009 - 2010)			Year Two (2010 - 2011)			Year Three (2011 - 2012)			Three-Year Rolling Average *		
Individual Student Growth: .8 School-wide Student Growth: .1 Year One Growth: .73			Individual Student Growth: 1.2 School-wide Student Growth: .5 Year Two Growth: 1.13			Individual Student Growth: .7 School-wide Student Growth: .5 Year Three Growth: .68			.85		
Does not meet expected growth	Meets expected growth	Exceeds expected growth	Does not meet expected growth	Meets expected growth	Exceeds expected growth	Does not meet expected growth	Meets expected growth	Exceeds expected growth	Does not meet expected growth	Meets expected growth	Exceeds expected growth

Overall Status:	Needs improvement	Effective	Highly Effective
------------------------	-------------------	-----------	------------------



Hot Topics

EVALUATION PROCESS

[HTTP://THISMEETING.WIKISPACES.COM](http://thismeeting.wikispaces.com)



PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA State Board of Education | Department of Public Instruction



Evaluation Process

- Teachers hired late in the year
- New evaluation instruments for student services personnel
- Requirements for Principal/AP
- Training for Instructional Central Office evaluation process



Hot Topics

ONLINE EVALUATION SYSTEM



PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF NORTH CAROLINA State Board of Education | Department of Public Instruction



Online Evaluation System or NCEES

- Multiple PDPs
- Preliminary PDP, roll-over PDP, PDP created by evaluator
- LEA contacts uploading information without the “McREL Spreadsheet”
- UIDs



Online Evaluation System or NCEES

- Training for new hires
- New DPI employee to just work with evaluation systems
- Not demonstrated vs. not look for
- Lock down date will probably be June 30, 2012 for both teacher and administrator tools



Online Evaluation System or NCEES

<http://ncees.ncdpi.wikispaces.net/>

